



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,078	04/12/2004	Debra K. Stephens	U03-0193.77	3077
54494 7590 04/17/2008 MOORE AND VAN ALLEN PLLC FOR SEMC P.O. BOX 13706 430 DAVIS DRIVE, SUITE 500 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709				
EXAMINER BHATTACHARYA, SAM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/709,078

Applicant(s)

STEPHENS, DEBRA K.

Examiner

Sam Bhattacharya

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date see attached 1449
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky (U. S. 5,559,860) in view of Speight (U.S. 2005/0207560).

Regarding claim 1, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses user selectable response to an incoming call at a mobile station. In addition Mizikovsky discloses a method of automatically answering a mobile phone comprising: receiving a call; detecting the calling party's phone number using a caller ID function (which reads on column 11 lines 40-65), determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself (which reads on column 13 lines 1-21).

However Mizikovsky fails to disclose automatically answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself and creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party.

In the same field of endeavor, Speight discloses automatically answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself and creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party. See paragraph 40. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to improve Mizikovsky by incorporating this limitations as taught by Snyder for the purpose ensuring that a desired call does not go unanswered.

Regarding claim 2, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set fourth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the mobile phone answers itself only after a pre-set number offings (which reads on column 12 lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 3, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set fourth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the step of determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable to answer itself comprises: of causing the mobile phone accessing a table containing one or more phone number entries that have been identified as incoming calling phone numbers answer itself (which reads on column 7 lines 21-31).

Regarding claim 4, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set fourth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the step of determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself comprises accessing the mobile phone's contact/phonebook (which reads on 46 caller ID memory) entries phone number matches a to determine if the incoming phone number in the mobile phone's internal phonebook (which reads on column 12 lines 60-67); and if a match is found, determining whether an override flag has been set for the phone number in the mobile phone's internal phonebook, said override flag capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself (which reads on column 7 lines 21-31).

Regarding claim 5, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set fourth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses automatically answering a mobile

phone comprising: receiving a call; diverting the call to a voice mail feature if the call is not answered within a pre-set number offings; monitoring the keypad entries input by the calling party (which reads on column 2 lines 21-31); determining if the keypad entries input by the calling party match a pre-set code; if the keypad entries input pre-set code, returning by the calling party matchthe control of the call to the mobile phone; and automatically answering the call (which reads on column 1 lines 13-34). However Mizikovsky fails to disclose creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party.

In the same field of endeavor, Speight discloses caller information controlled automatic answer feature for telephone. In addition Snyder discloses creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party (which reads on paragraph 40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve Mizikovsky by'modifying the user selectable response to an incoming call at a mobile station with creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party as taught by Snyder for the purpose answering a call.

Regarding claim 6, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set fourth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses automatically answering a mobile phone comprising: means for receiving a call; means for detecting the calling party's phone number using a caller ID function (which reads on column 12 lines 60-67); means for determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself, and means for automatically answering the call if the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone

to answer itself (which reads on column 2 lines 21-31). However Mizikovsky fails to disclose creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party.

In the same field of endeavor, Snyder discloses caller information controlled automatic answer feature for telephone. In addition Snyder discloses creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party (which reads on column 1 lines 24-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve Mizikovsky by modifying the user selectable response to an incoming call at a mobile station with creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party as taught by Snyder for the purpose answering a call.

Regarding claim 7, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the system answers itself only after a pre-set number of rings. (which reads on column 2 lines 26-31).

Regarding claim 8, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the means for determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself comprises: means for accessing a table containing one or more phone number entries that have been identified as incoming calling phone numbers capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself (which reads on column 2 lines 21-31).

Regarding claim 9, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses the means for determining if the calling party's phone number has been flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself comprises means for accessing the mobile phone's contact/phonebook

entries to determine if the incoming phone number matches a phone number in the mobile phone's internal phonebook, and if a match is found, means for determining whether an override flag has been set for the phone number in the mobile phone's internal phonebook, said override flag capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself (which reads on column 12 lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 10, Mizikovsky discloses essentially all the claimed invention as set forth in the instant application, further Mizikovsky discloses automatically answering a mobile phone comprising : means for receiving a call; means for diverting the call to a voice mail feature if the call is not answered within a pre-set number of rings; means for monitoring the keypad entries input by the calling party, means for determining if the keypad entries input by the calling party match a pre-set code (which reads on column 12 lines 60-67); if the keypad entries input by the calling party match the pre-set code, means for returning control of the call to the mobile phone; and means for automatically answering the call (which reads on column 7 lines 21-31). However Mizikovsky fails to disclose automatically answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself and creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party.

In the same field of endeavor, Speight discloses automatically answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself and creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party. See paragraph 40. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve Mizikovsky by incorporating this limitations as taught by Snyder for the purpose ensuring that a desired call does not go unanswered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (571) 272-7917. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sb

/Sam Bhattacharya/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617